



# Journal of Educational Sciences

Journal homepage: <https://jes.ejournal.unri.ac.id/index.php/JES>



P-ISSN  
2581-1657

E-ISSN  
2581-2203

## A Case Study of Teacher's Practice and Students' Preferences of Corrective Feedback in English Speaking Activities in The Classroom

Sheila Oktavani\*, Elih Sutisna Yanto, Fauzi Miftakh  
University of Singaperbangsa Karawang Karawang, 41361, Indonesia

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received: 16 Aug 2023

Revised: 01 July 2024

Accepted: 03 July 2024

Published online: 24 July 2024

#### Keywords:

Corrective Feedback;  
Students' Preferences;  
Teacher Practice

### ABSTRACT

Corrective feedback as a strategy in teaching and learning speaking skills in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) has become a topic of interest in educational research. Although there are numerous studies on corrective feedback in speaking activities, there is still a limited amount of research involving Indonesian junior high school students as participants and using a qualitative descriptive case study. This study aims to examine the teacher practice and student preferences regarding the use of corrective feedback in classroom speaking activities with 7th grade students of Karawang Junior High School as participants. The study used a descriptive case study with a qualitative approach. The data collection technique consisted of observation and interview. Data were analyzed using Miles and Huberman's (1984) interactive model. The findings revealed that the students had a positive attitude towards corrective feedback and recognized its benefits in improving their pronunciation and vocabulary. They prefer immediate responses in challenging circumstances and are satisfied with the amount of feedback they have received. This has the potential to improve EFL teaching practice by allowing teachers to reassess their teaching, particularly in terms of speaking skills, to improve EFL students' speaking skills.

## 1. Introduction

In practically every context, speaking is the most frequently employed language skill (Crysta, 2010). It is very important in communicating. Since then, it has motivated people to make significant efforts to gain the talent in order to communicate with the global society. However, performing the speaking talent is not as straightforward as students believe. They must not only speak fluently but also accurately. This could cause them a lot of stress. Mistakes and blunders may

\* Corresponding author.  
E-mail: sheila.oktavani29@gmail.com

occur on a regular basis, necessitating the need to aid learners with the method and, as a result, enhance speaking skills.

The role of corrective feedback is one of the teaching speaking issues. When students speak in the target language, teachers typically utilize corrective feedback to rectify their errors. Despite having different definitions, corrective feedback has many similarities. Corrective feedback, according to Khunaivi and Hartono (2015), is used to limit the potential of incorrectness or errors in the target language. Furthermore, Li (2018) defines corrective feedback as a response to a learner's error output, regardless of whether the error causes communication problems. Corrective feedback takes the form of comments to incorrect learner utterances. Responses may comprise (a) notification of an error, (b) provision of the correct target language form, or (c) meta-linguistic information on the origin of the issue, or any combination of these." Using the definitions provided by the experts above, we can conclude that corrective feedback is an action conducted by the teacher to decrease errors caused by students or learners when producing the target language.

Making mistakes in the target language is common for EFL students, especially in Indonesia. It is consistent with Dilek (2015). He stated that student blunders when utilizing the target language are unavoidable. Brown and Rodgers (2002, as cited in Gorji et al., 2023) go on to say that all language learners make mistakes when learning a new language. This is due to the fact that English is not the students' native language. Furthermore, there are relatively few exposures to the target language in the EFL environment because it is only taught in school as part of the national curriculum and there is little opportunity to use it in society. Furthermore, there isn't enough time in class to practice the target language. As a result, the primary source for addressing those errors will be the teacher. In Vocational High Schools in the field of tourism expertise, chemistry subjects are not studied directly as subjects, but are integrated into applied science subjects (Afinda, 2023).

When students have had little exposure to the target language, teachers must provide feedback or rectify errors. According to Zhao (2015), corrective feedback is a technique used by teachers to reduce student error. Students' critical thinking abilities are very necessary to shape students' cognitive strengths (Agustia, 2024). According to Li (2018), corrective feedback is a teacher's response to student errors, which can alter the communication process and lead to communication issues. Corrective feedback, then, is a teacher's technique of addressing pupils' faults in learning tasks.

Corrective feedback is divided into two types: written feedback and oral feedback. Each sort of corrective feedback defines itself. When students make mistakes throughout the learning process, they receive written corrective feedback, whereas pupils who make mistakes receive vocal or oral corrective feedback. In the context of speaking activities, the most prevalent corrective feedback is oral corrective feedback, as classified by Lyster and Ranta (1997). There are six categories that include samples of the student's spoken activities: Recast,

---

### Metalinguistic Feedback, Elicitation, Explicit Correction, Repetition, and Clarification Request.

According to the research conducted by Şakiroğlu (2020), three primary techniques have been identified in relation to the timing of providing correction. Initially, it is possible to provide rapid corrective feedback to the pupil upon the occurrence of an error. Furthermore, the provision of corrective feedback can be administered subsequent to the completion of the student's oral performance. This approach is alternatively referred to as the delayed strategy. Thirdly, the post-delayed technique pertains to the provision of corrective feedback subsequent to the conclusion of the class session or even at the subsequent meeting.

Consequently, Méndez and Cruz (2012) emphasized the significance of considering the frequency of providing corrective feedback as a matter of utmost importance for educators. Excessive provision of critical feedback by teachers can have a detrimental impact on both the academic achievement and attitude of students. On the contrary, when students receive a reduced amount of corrective feedback, they may see it as a hindrance to their ability to effectively and efficiently engage in the learning process.

The issue of corrective feedback might occur either immediately following an error or at a later time, once the learners have concluded their communicative activity. This is a common practice among educators in their instructional and educational endeavors. In addition to offering students the accurate form of the language, teachers must use discernment in filtering error production when they identify errors. According to Lyster (1998, as cited in Syakira & Syahril, 2022), errors made by learners in the target language, specifically English in this case, can be categorized into four forms: grammatical errors, phonological errors, lexical errors, and the uninvited use of the first language (L1).

The examination of corrective feedback extends beyond teachers. Nevertheless, it is crucial to thoroughly examine this aspect as a crucial element of students' academic performance within the context of classroom learning, particularly in relation to the development of speaking skills. In relation to the utilization of corrective feedback within the educational setting, certain pupils possess the ability to promptly rectify their mistakes, while others necessitate many instances of correction. Muslem and Abbas (2017) argue that teachers should take into account the condition and characteristics of pupils when providing remedial feedback. The reason for this assertion is that the teacher typically does not provide remedial feedback to each student in a uniform manner.

The statement aligns with the remark made by Agudo and de Dios (2013) regarding the adaptability of delivering corrective feedback to address both the cognitive and emotive requirements of the student. In summary, it is advisable for the teacher to address each student's errors individually, as it is not feasible to approach every student in an identical manner. Certain students may experience a decrease in motivation or even feelings of anxiety as a result of their inability to effectively comprehend the feedback provided to them. The primary focus of

---

evaluating the efficiency of this implementation should be on students' inclination towards remedial feedback.

The significance of implementing corrective feedback is equally crucial to the manner in which students interpret it. Several studies investigate the utilization and interpretation of corrective feedback. In a study conducted by Gamlo (2019), an investigation was undertaken to examine the preferences of Saudi Arabian learners regarding corrective feedback in speaking activities. The writers discovered that the students had a favorable disposition towards receiving corrective feedback during speaking activities. They expressed high agreement with the notion that their teacher's corrective feedback had the potential to enhance their speaking abilities. This aligns with the study conducted by Van Ha et al. (2021) on the topic of spoken corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classroom from a teaching and learning perspective.

Through the implementation of an interview and questionnaire, the writers's investigation revealed certain correspondences and disparities between the perspectives held by teachers and pupils. Both educators and students placed a significant emphasis on the effectiveness of feedback and expressed a favorable attitude towards explicit forms of feedback, such as explicit corrections and metalinguistic feedback.

In recent years, scholars such as Muslem et al. (2021) and Mulyani et al. (2022) have undertaken research to investigate students' preferences for oral corrective feedback in speaking activities, as well as the many sorts of oral corrective feedback employed by teachers. Both parties reached a consensus that oral corrective criticism had a good impact on students' speaking performances. Both teachers and students stand to benefit from engaging in studies that explore the significance of providing and receiving oral corrective feedback. This mutual understanding can enhance their overall comprehension and appreciation of this instructional practice.

Based on the previous explanation and prior research highlights, the writers intend to undertake a case study investigation focusing on the instructional methods employed by teachers and the inclinations of students towards corrective feedback within a selected junior high school located in Karawang, Indonesia. The consideration is in the fact that the professors provide corrective feedback to pupils with varying educational backgrounds and levels of English proficiency. There exists a subset of students that possess a certain level of familiarity with the English language, exhibit shyness, or have apprehension when it comes to actively engaging in classroom activities. In order to conduct a more comprehensive analysis of the implementation of corrective feedback, The writers aim to investigate the practices of teachers in providing corrective feedback and the preferences of students regarding its implementation in English speaking activities at a junior high school in Karawang.

---

## 2. Methodology

The present study utilizes a qualitative methodology, specifically employing a descriptive case study method. The selection of this particular study approach is based on its aim to investigate the phenomena occurring in a real-life situation, together with its associated characteristics (Gall et al., 2007). The focus of this study pertains to the utilization of corrective feedback within the context of speaking activities conducted in a classroom setting. By employing this approach, the writers acquired comprehensive and precise data pertaining to corrective feedback.

This study involves the design of two instruments, specifically observation and interview. During the observation, the writers examined the various sorts of corrective feedback provided to the students, as well as the timing at which it is administered. The focus of the interview was limited to obtaining information regarding the teacher's perspectives and implementation of corrective feedback, as well as the preferences and perceptions of students towards corrective feedback.

In order to assess the validity of the information, a sample of participants comprising teachers and 7th grade students from a junior high school in Karawang was chosen. The individuals in question are selected as participants for the study due to their ability to provide valuable insights into the research questions and contribute to a deeper comprehension of the phenomenon under investigation. In summary, the aforementioned information is being utilized to make inferences on the instructional methods employed by teachers and the preferences of students regarding corrective feedback during English language classes that involve speaking activities. These inferences are supported by relevant theoretical frameworks and the outcomes of prior research studies.

## 3. Results and Discussion

### *Teachers' Practice of Corrective Feedback (CF) in Speaking Activities*

The act of observing has resulted in the initial discovery. The teacher views corrective feedback as an essential component of every instructional session. However, the duration for providing comments may differ according on the cognitive abilities of the students. In the context of kids exhibiting above-average intellect, educators often use a wait-and-see strategy, wherein they provide these pupils the opportunity to complete their sentences prior to providing criticism. Conversely, individuals with lesser cognitive abilities exhibit more proficiency in promptly rectifying errors, including those pertaining to individual words, and consistently offer ongoing assistance throughout the correction procedure.

Moreover, the teachers modify their input in accordance with the unique cognitive abilities of each student. Students who possess high levels of intelligence tend to choose for concise explanations in order to rectify their errors. This phenomenon can be attributed to the kids' aptitude for rapid comprehension and self-correction.

---

In contrast, educators exhibit greater patience and comprehension towards students with weaker cognitive abilities, recognizing their potential requirement for supplementary guidance and repetitive instruction in order to grasp proper usage and pronunciation.

Teacher : *Tergantung kondisi siswa. Jika tingkat intelegensi siswa di atas rata-rata, maka saya menunggu siswa tersebut menyelesaikan satu kalimat lalu diberi umpan balik korektif. Namun jika siswa intelegensinya rendah, setiap satu kata yang salah langsung diperbaiki saat itu juga serta ditemani saat perbaikan ucapan katanya.*  
*[It depends on the student's condition. If the student's intelligence level is above average, I wait for the student to finish one sentence and then give corrective feedback. However, if the student's intelligence is low, every wrong word is immediately corrected on the spot and followed by correcting his speech.]*

Teacher : *Saya melakukan umpan balik korektif berbeda-beda disesuaikan dengan kecerdasan anak. Untuk siswa yang tingkat kecerdasan high, cukup dijelaskan sebentar saja siswa tersebut bisa langsung memahami, sedangkan siswa dengan kecerdasan low membutuhkan lebih banyak kesabaran dari guru.*  
*[I implement different corrective feedback based on the student's intelligence. For students with high levels of intelligence, it is enough to explain briefly and students can immediately understand, while students with low intelligence require more patience from the teacher.]*

In addition, it is worth noting that teachers refrain from utilizing remedial comments during examinations or assessments. It is believed that by establishing a non-threatening setting during evaluations, students are able to concentrate on showcasing their knowledge and skills without experiencing apprehension regarding close correction.

Teacher : *Saya tidak memberikan umpan balik korektif baik untuk pengucapan, kosa kata, pemahaman, ataupun kelancaran siswa saat melakukan ulangan / evaluasi. Selain ulangan/evaluasi, saya biasa memberikan umpan balik korektif pada siswa.*  
*[I do not provide corrective feedback for students' pronunciation, vocabulary, understanding, or fluency when doing tests / evaluations. Aside from tests/evaluations, I usually provide corrective feedback to students.]*

As a result, offering remedial feedback has significant benefits for students. It serves as a tool for introspection, assisting pupils in identifying their own flaws and understanding the appropriate way to express themselves. Teachers help

students avoid making similar mistakes in the future by addressing faults as soon as they occur.

### ***Students' Preferences of Corrective Feedback (CF) Practice in Speaking Activities***

The following observational finding identified three unique groups based on intellect levels. There are three levels: low, middle, and high. The high-level students: These students were given both immediate and delayed correction feedback. The corrected feedback was judged to be precise and easily understandable. Middle-school students: Students in this group received both immediate and delayed correction comments. In this case, students still thought the corrected criticism was understandable. The low-level students were given immediate feedback. Because these students first struggled to understand their speaking faults, the teacher provided an explanation after delivering the remedial criticism.

The remaining students (24 out of 36) received post-delayed classical remedial comments. This feedback was mostly post-delayed and comprised primarily of Recasts and Repetition. According to these data, the majority of students received feedback after finishing their speaking tasks, and the input largely consisted of restating or rephrasing their utterances to improve accuracy. Additionally, there are reports indicating that students have increased feelings of happiness and confidence when they receive corrective criticism from their teachers. The participants acknowledged the beneficial effects of receiving corrective feedback on their oral proficiency and did not view it as having negative consequences on their self-assurance, speaking performance, or overall learning process.

Student 1 : *Umpan balik korektif sangat bermanfaat karena memicu semangat agar bisa lebih sering, rutin dan tekun belajar bahasa Inggris, terutama meningkatkan kemampuan speaking dalam bahasa Inggris.*

*[Corrective feedback is very useful because it triggers enthusiasm so that I can study English more often, routinely and diligently, especially for improving my speaking skills in English.]*

Student 5 : *Umpan balik korektif bermanfaat karena lebih memotivasi siswa untuk belajar bahasa Inggris agar tidak mendapatkan umpan balik korektif dalam proses pembelajaran di kelas bahasa Inggris.*

*[Corrective feedback is useful because it motivates students to learn English more so they don't get corrective feedback in the learning process in English class.]*

Furthermore, the instructor exhibited a discerning methodology for offering constructive criticism, customizing techniques based on individual students' cognitive abilities and delivering timely interventions to facilitate the educational progression. The students conveyed their contentment regarding the quantity of

---

corrective feedback they were provided, acknowledging its beneficial influence on their pronunciation, vocabulary, and overall oral communication abilities.

Student 2 : *Perbaikan biasa dilakukan guru pada pengucapan dan kosa kata. Biasanya guru memberikan lebih dari 5 kali umpan balik korektif. saya sangat puas dengan pemberian umpan balik korektif oleh guru dan umpan balik korektif tersebut sangat membantu.*  
*[Corrections are usually made by the teacher on pronunciation and vocabulary. Usually the teacher gives more than 5 times corrective feedback. I am very satisfied with that amount of feedback, and the given corrective feedback is very helpful.]*

Although recasts are widely acknowledged as the most efficacious type of corrective feedback, repetition has demonstrated very limited efficacy. This analysis provides insights into the varying application of immediate, delayed, and post-delayed remedial feedback, depending upon the individual student's level of performance.

### ***Discussion***

The corrective feedback processes employed by teachers align with the rule proposed by Gibbs and Simpson (2004). The definitions encompass a range of activities, including the identification and rectification of errors, the provision of clarification, and the suggestion of specific learning tasks. Teachers endeavor to mitigate student errors and foster linguistic growth through the provision of rectified feedback. Moreover, the teacher's strategy of adopting a wait-and-see approach with above-average students acknowledges the importance of student autonomy and self-correction, allowing them to complete sentences independently prior to receiving feedback.

This technique bears resemblance to the concept of promoting metacognition and boosting overall skills as outlined in the definition of corrective feedback. In contrast, promptly addressing errors made by students with weaker cognitive abilities demonstrates the teacher's acknowledgement of their ongoing requirement for sustained assistance and direction throughout the repair procedure. The teacher's ability to alter feedback ways based on individual intelligence levels demonstrates pedagogical flexibility and responsiveness to the diverse learning demands of students, as highlighted by Zhao (2015) and Li (2018).

Lyster and Ranta (1997) proposed a taxonomy that categorizes several forms of corrective feedback utilized in language instruction. These include recasts, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, explicit correction, repetition, and clarification requests. This categorization provides teachers with a structure for addressing certain types of faults and promoting students' learning and ability to fix themselves. Sepehrinia and Mehdizadeh (2016) and Alsolami (2019) posit that

---



the utilization of these feedback systems by educators aims to enhance students' oral proficiency and address common difficulties encountered in speaking.

The teacher concurs with the viewpoints expressed by Sakiroglu (2020) and Olmezer-ozturk (2019) on the significance of timing and consistency in the provision of feedback, as indicated by the research findings. The instructor ought to carefully deliberate on the optimal timing for providing feedback, take into account the students' preferences, and carefully weigh any potential disruptions to their spoken performance. Furthermore, as Méndez and Cruz (2012) have pointed out, it is important for the teacher to regulate the frequency of corrective feedback and refrain from excessive correction, since it might potentially have a negative impact on students' academic achievements and overall attitude.

The variability in the frequency of corrective feedback received by students indicates that the quantity of feedback provided may be influenced by individual requirements and performance levels. This aligns with the findings presented by Méndez and Cruz (2012), which emphasize the importance of providing a proportion in the frequency of corrective feedback. An excessive amount of feedback might potentially have a negative impact on students' academic performance and attitude, whilst an insufficient amount may be perceived as hindering the learning process. Therefore, it is crucial to have an understanding of students' errors and their preferences for receiving feedback in order to facilitate effective and significant learning outcomes.

Furthermore, the inclination towards receiving prompt feedback in difficult circumstances corresponds with the theoretical framework elucidated by Sakiroglu (2020). The author outlines three primary approaches to the temporal implementation of corrective feedback, namely: immediate, delayed, and post-delayed. The students' inclination towards prompt response aligns with the findings of the survey conducted by Zhu and Wang (2019). The survey findings suggest that there is a strong inclination towards the implementation of prompt interventions in order to effectively address challenges and enhance proficiency in oral communication. According to Olmezer-ozturk (2019), maintaining consistency in the timing of corrective feedback is crucial for teachers to optimize its efficiency and efficacy in the instruction of English speaking.

Furthermore, with regards to the preferred forms of remedial feedback among students, it was shown that recasts were perceived as the most efficacious variety. Recasts facilitate students in comprehending their errors and promptly receiving the appropriate model. According to Lyster and Ranta (1997), recast is identified as one of the various forms of oral corrective feedback. Recasts refer to the process of rephrasing an incorrect term or word without expressly providing the accurate response. Conversely, students perceived repetition to be less efficacious, so impeding comprehension and impeding active participation.

The implementation of differentiated corrective feedback based on competence levels has garnered substantial support from a multitude of studies in the field of language teaching. The present study examines the teacher's modification of the

---

timing of corrective feedback in relation to the intelligence levels of pupils. The students were classified into three distinct categories depending on their academic aptitude: lower intellect, middle level, and high level. Distinct categories of remedial feedback were provided to each individual group during the learning phase. Immediate remedial feedback was offered to students with inferior cognitive abilities. In contrast, both middle- and high-level students were provided with both immediate and delayed corrective feedback. Additionally, it was noted that students at an advanced level were provided with the chance to finish their sentences prior to obtaining evaluation. This methodology guarantees that the provision of feedback is customized to cater to the specific requirements of each student, while still adhering to the principles and concepts outlined in the philosophy of corrective feedback.

The students' general level of contentment with the quantity of corrective feedback offered by their teachers demonstrates the significance and recognition they attribute to this input in enhancing their pronunciation and vocabulary skills. This discovery provides evidence in favor of the notion that corrective feedback plays a crucial role in language acquisition and has the potential to enhance students' linguistic abilities. The assertion aligns with the theoretical framework put forward by Li (2018), which posits that corrective feedback plays a role in influencing the communication process and has the potential to effectively mitigate communication difficulties.

The efficacy of recasts as the predominant kind of corrective feedback aligns with the categorization system put forward by Lyster and Ranta (1997), which delineates various types of corrective feedback. Recasts refer to the instructional technique wherein the teacher rephrases the students' utterance, using the appropriate form or pronunciation. This approach enables students to recognize their errors and promptly obtain the correct linguistic model. The study noted that this form of feedback has the potential to boost comprehension and facilitate progress. The theory of corrective feedback underscores the significance of offering precise language information and direct rectification, which can be accomplished through the use of recasts (Zhao, 2015; Sepehrinia & Mehdizadeh, 2016). Hence, the efficacy of recasts aligns with the results of the research and the prevailing theoretical framework.

Finally, the data obtained from observations provide evidence that justifies the implementation of distinct forms of corrective feedback, namely immediate, timed, and post-delayed, depending on the individual skill levels of students. The aforementioned approach, which involves modifying the timing of corrective information, aligns with the concept of corrective feedback as posited by numerous scholars in the field. The level of contentment among students regarding the quantity of corrective feedback offered by their instructors, their inclination for prompt feedback when encountering challenges, and the efficacy of recasts as the most favored form of feedback align with established theories on corrective feedback. Teachers have the capacity to develop appropriate instructional methodologies that cater to the unique needs of students and foster

---

successful language acquisition by taking into account these empirical observations and theoretical perspectives.

#### **4. Conclusion**

Finally, based on student competency levels, the observation data support the differential usage of immediate, timed, and post-delayed remedial feedback. This method, which alters the timing of remedial input, aligns to the concept of corrective feedback as defined by numerous experts. The overall satisfaction of students with the amount of corrective feedback provided by their teachers, their preference for immediate feedback when faced with difficulties, and the effectiveness of recasts as the most preferred type of feedback are all consistent with existing corrective feedback theories. By taking these facts and theoretical ideas into account, teachers can develop appropriate teaching approaches that meet the needs of individual students and promote effective language acquisition. Furthermore, the students' choices show a favorable attitude toward remedial feedback and an understanding of its benefits in developing their pronunciation and vocabulary. They prefer immediate response in stressful situations and are pleased with the quantity of remedial feedback they have received. Recasts have been found as the most effective sort of corrective feedback, allowing students to grasp their faults and promptly obtain the proper model. The findings are consistent with previous research on students' preferences and perceptions of corrective feedback, emphasizing the significance of taking students' wants and preferences into account in order to provide successful and meaningful learning.

#### **Acknowledgement**

Praise be to the Almighty, the Lord of all realms. The authors express gratitude to the Divine for the continued blessings, guidance and strength that have enable possible the successful completion of this research endeavor. The first author sincerely thank her mentors, Mr Elih Sutisna Yanto and Mr Fauzi Miftakh, for their invaluable help and support throughout the research process. We also thank you to all the participants who voluntarily participated in the study.

#### **References**

- Afinda, B. N., Anwar, S., & Sumarna, O. (2023). Analysis of The Need for Applied Science Teaching Materials in Chemical Materials in Vocational School, Department of Culinary, Tangerang District. *Journal of Education and Learning Research*, 1(1), 30-36.
- Agustia, Z., Yennita, Y., & Fakhruddin, F. (2024). Profile of Critical Thinking Ability of Class VIII State Middle School Students in Science Learning. *Journal of Education and Learning Research*, 2(1), 46-53.
- Alsolami, R. (2019). Effect of Oral Corrective Feedback on Language Skills. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 9(6), 672-677.
-

- 
- Agudo, M., & de Dios, J. (2013). An Investigation into how EFL Learners Emotionally Respond to Teachers' Oral Corrective Feedback. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 15(2), 265-278.
- Crysta, D. (2010). English as a Global Language, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Dilek, F. (2015). Learners Preferences of Oral Corrective Feedback: An Example of Turkish as a Foreign Language Learners. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 10(9), 1311-1317.
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2007). *Educational Research: An Introduction* (8th ed.). Pearson.
- Gamlo, N. H. (2019). EFL Learners' Preferences of Corrective Feedback in Speaking Activities. *World*, 9(2). doi:10.5430/wjel.v9n2p28
- Gibbs, G., & Simpson, C. (2004). Does your Assessment Support Your Students' Learning. *Journal of Teaching and learning in Higher Education*, 1(1), 1-30.
- Gorji, F., Afraz, S., & Samimi, F. (2023). Assessing English Language Quality of EFL Students: Links to A Grounded Theory. *Journal of Language, Culture, and Translation*, 5(1), 133-149.
- Khunaiivi, H., & Hartono, R. (2015). Teacher's and Student's Perceptions Of Corrective Feedback In Teaching Speaking. *English Education Journal*, 5(2). Retrieved from <https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/eej/article/view/9799>
- Li, S. (2018). Corrective Feedback in L2 Speech Production. *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, 1-9.
- Lyster, R. and L. Ranta. (1997) 'Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake'. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 19/1: 37-66
- Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, Recasts, and Explicit Correction in Relation to Error Types and Learner Repair in Immersion Classrooms. *Language Learning*, 48(2), 183-218.
- Mulyani, S., Ningsih, N., & Setyaningrum, N. I. (2022). Students' preferences Towards Oral Corrective Feedback In A Speaking Class. *Eternal (English, Teaching, Learning, and Research Journal)*, 8(1), 174-183. doi: <https://doi.org/10.24252/Eternal.V81.2022.A12>
- Muslem, A., & Abbas, M. (2017). The Effectiveness of Immersive Multimedia Learning with Peer Support on English Speaking and Reading Aloud. *International Journal of Instruction*, 10(1), 203-218.
- Muslem, A., Zulfikar, T., Astilla, I., Heriansyah, H., & Marhaban, S. (2021). Students' Preferences toward Oral Corrective feedback in Speaking Classroom: A Case at English Education Department Students. *International Journal of Language Education*, 5(4), 244-259. doi: <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v5i4.19010>
- Olmezer-Ozturk, E. (2019). Beliefs and Practices of Turkish EFL Teachers Regarding Oral Corrective Feedback: a Small-Scale Classroom Research Study. *The Language Learning Journal*, 47(2), 219-228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2016.1263360>
- Sakiroglu, H. Ü. (2020). Oral Corrective Feedback Preferences of University Students in English Communication Classes. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, 6(1), 172-178.
-

- Sepehrinia, S., & Mehdizadeh, M. (2016). Oral Corrective Feedback: Teachers' Concerns and Researchers' Orientation. *The Language Learning Journal*, 46(4), 483–500. doi:10.1080/09571736.2016.1172328
- Syakira, S., & Sahril, S. (2022). Learners' Perceptions on the use of Oral Corrective Feedback in One-to-One EFL Classroom. *Eralingua: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Asing dan Sastra*, 6(2).
- Van Ha, X., Nguyen, L. T., & Hung, B. P. (2021). Oral Corrective Feedback in English as a Foreign Language Classrooms: A Teaching and Learning Perspective. *Heliyon*, 7(7), e07550.
- Zhao, W. (2015). Learners' Preferences for Oral Corrective Feedback and their Effects on Second Language Noticing and Learning Motivation. McGill University (canada).
- Zhu, Y., & Wang, B. (2019). Investigating English Language Learners' Beliefs About oral Corrective Feedback at Chinese Universities: A Large-Scale Survey. *Language awareness*, 28(2), 139-161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2019.1620755>

How to cite this article:

Oktavani, S., Yanto, E. S., & Miftakh, F. (2024). A Case Study of Teacher's Practice and Students' Preferences of Corrective Feedback in English Speaking Activities in The Classroom. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 8(3), 336-348.

---